

## APPENDIX A

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
Para. 50: SEC dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SEAI relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.	Para. 47	Para. 40	Para. 61	Para. 46	Para. 47	Para. 52	Para. 34	Para. 65	Para. 50
Para. 51: SEC dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.	Para. 48		Para. 62	Para. 47	Para. 48	Para. 53	Para. 35	Para. 66	Para. 51
Para. 52: SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI America relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.	Para. 49		Para 63	Para. 48	Para. 49	Para. 54	Para. 36	Para. 67	Para. 52
Para. 53: SEC and	Para. 50		Para. 64	Para. 49	Para. 50	Para. 55	Para. 37	Para. 68	Para. 53

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI Mexico relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint									
Para. 54: SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI Brazil relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.	Para. 51		Para. 65	Para. 50	Para. 51	Para. 56	Para. 38	Para. 69	Para. 54
Para. 55: SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI Shenzhen relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.	Para. 52		Para. 66	Para. 51	Para. 52	Para. 57	Para. 39	Para. 70	Para. 55
Para. 56: SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and	Para. 53		Para 67	Para. 52	Para. 53	Para. 58	Para. 40	Para. 71	Para. 56

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI Tianjin relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.									
Para. 57: SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies, and affairs of Samsung SDI Malaysia relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.	Para. 54		Para 68	Para. 53	Para. 54	Para. 59	Para. 41	Para. 72	Para. 57
Para. 150: Between 1995 and 2007, Defendant Samsung, through SEC, Samsung SDI, Samsung SDI Malaysia, Samsung SDI Shenzhen and Samsung SDI Tianjin, participated in at least 200 glass meetings at all levels. A substantial number of these meetings were attended by the highest ranking executives of	Para. 148	Para. 127	Para. 158	Para. 146	Para. 147	Para. 152	Para. 130	Para. 166	Para. 150

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
Samsung. Samsung also engaged in bilateral discussions with each of the other Defendants on a regular basis. Through these discussions, Samsung agreed on prices and supply levels for CRTs.									
Para. 151: Defendants SEAI, Samsung SDI America, Samsung SDI Brazil and Samsung SDI Mexico were represented at those meetings and were a party to the agreements entered at them. To the extent that SEC and SEAI sold and/or distributed CRT Products, they played a significant role in the conspiracy because defendants wished to ensure that the prices for CRT Products paid by direct purchasers would not undercut the CRT	Para. 149	Para. 127	Para. 159	Para. 147	Para. 148	Para. 153	Para. 131	Para. 167	Para. 151

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
pricing agreements reached at the glass meetings. Thus SEAI, Samsung SDI America, Samsung SDI Brazil and Samsung SDI Mexico were knowing participants in the alleged conspiracy.									
Para. 159: The individual participants entered into agreements on behalf of, and reported these meetings and discussions to, their respective corporate families. As a result the entire corporate family was represented in meetings and discussions by their agents and were parties to the agreements reached in them.	Para. 157	Para. 135	Para. 165	Para. 155	Para. 156	Para. 161	Para. 151	Para. 175	Para. 159
Para. 182: On March 18, 2011, the DOJ issued a press release	Para. 177	Para. 146		Para. 175	Para. 176	Para. 181	Para. 168	Para. 195	Para. 179

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
announcing that it had reached an agreement with Defendant Samsung SDI in which it would plead guilty and pay a \$32 million fine for its role in a conspiracy to fix prices of CDTs.									
Para. 183: Samsung SDI admitted that from at least as early as January 1997 until at least as late as March 2006, participated in a conspiracy among major CDT producers to fix prices, reduce output, and allocate market shares of CDTs sold in the United States and elsewhere. Samsung SDI admitted that in furtherance of the conspiracy it, through its officers and employees, engaged in discussions and attended meetings	Para. 178	Para. 146		Para. 176	Para. 177	Para. 182	Para. 168	Para. 195	Para. 180

<b>Circuit City Complaint</b>	<b>CompuCom Complaint</b>	<b>Costco Complaint</b>	<b>Electrograph Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Interbond Complaint</b>	<b>Office Depot Complaint</b>	<b>P.C. Richard Complaint</b>	<b>Polaroid Complaint</b>	<b>Target Amended Complaint</b>	<b>Tweeter Complaint</b>
with representatives of other major CDT producers. During these discussions and meetings, agreements were reached to fix prices, reduce output, and allocate market share of CDTs to be sold in the United States and elsewhere.									